

Friend of the Court brief

Francis M. Wardlaw III
697 Brock Road
Honea Path, SC 29654

Office of Clerk of Court
Thomas D. Lambros United States Court House
125 Market Street
Youngstown, Ohio 44503

Sir:
Bainbridge v. Medline
Case (No.5:16-cv-00555)

One of the most sacred rights as humans is the right of consent.

By merely being in a certain subset of the population may put you into a group of people sharing a common trait, this does not make one a member of a class. However, to make that group a "class," without asking permission violates every member to the group's sacred right of consent.

Once the Right of consent is forfeited, then anarchy and chaos will erupt.

There is something to be said about the necessity to violate the right of consent in certain narrow situations:

War voids the right of consent in a narrow vein where the draft is imposed

Criminals forfeit their freedom and are sent to prison without their consent after due process

Even Eminent Domain for the good the public can require land to be seized without consent.

What would lead someone to direct a lawsuit to violate such a basic right? Money

Though I presume this formation of the class was legal, it was not morally right.

So why was it done? I presume that to send out a mail-back card and ask the individuals of a group to join a "class action" lawsuit would not have yielded the desired results sufficient to ensure a good payday.

Please consider these thoughts as you weigh the merits of this case:

Time is not a factor here. I would respectfully suggest that the case be tabled until a mail-back card is sent asking those of the group if they want to be counted in the "Class action lawsuit."

Thank You for your time.
Sincerely Yours,

Francis M. Wardlaw III

Francis M. Wardlaw, III